

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CHRISTINA R. PAOLI,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Civil Action No. 06-462 (GMS)
v.)	
)	
STATE OF DELAWARE and)	
DELAWARE TECHNICAL AND)	
COMMUNITY COLLEGE,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

WHEREAS, on July 28, 2006, plaintiff Christina Paoli (“Paoli”) filed this *pro se* action against the State of Delaware (the “State”) and Delaware Technical and Community College (“Delaware Tech”), alleging numerous violations of certain constitutional rights;

WHEREAS, on December 18, 2006, Delaware Tech filed a Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (D.I. 15);

WHEREAS, on December 18, 2007, the court issued an Memorandum and Order (D.I. 30) denying Delaware Tech’s motion with respect to Paoli’s section 1983 due process claim;

WHEREAS, on January 3, 2008, Delaware Tech filed a Motion for Reconsideration (D.I. 32), asking the court to reconsider its December 18, 2007 Memorandum and Order;

WHEREAS, a motion for reconsideration should be granted only “sparingly”;¹

WHEREAS, in this district, motions for reconsideration are granted only if it appears that the court has patently misunderstood a party, has made a decision outside the adversarial issues

¹ *Tristrata Tech. Inc. v. ICN Pharms., Inc.*, 313 F. Supp. 2d 405, 407 (D. Del. 2004); *Karr v. Castle*, 768 F. Supp. 1087, 1090 (D. Del. 1991).

presented by the parties, or has made an error not of reasoning, but of apprehension;² and

WHEREAS, the court concludes that none of the three above-cited conditions exist in the present case;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Delaware Tech's Motion for Reconsideration (D.I. 32) is DENIED.

Dated: February 4, 2008

/s/ Gregory M. Sleet

CHIEF, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

² See, e.g., *Shering Corp. v. Amgen, Inc.*, 25 F. Supp. 2d 293, 295 (D. Del. 1998); *Brambles USA, Inc. v. Blocker*, 735 F. Supp. 1239, 1240 (D. Del. 1990) (citing *Above the Belt, Inc. v. Mel Bonhannan Roofing, Inc.*, 99 F.R.D. 99 (E.D. Va. 1983)); see also *Karr*, 768 F. Supp. at 1090 (citing same).